UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/723,431	11/26/2003	Ning Hu	01992.007US1	6228

53137 7590 10/26/2007
VIKSNINS HARRIS & PADYS PLLP
P.O. BOX 111098
ST. PAUL, MN 55111-1098

EXAMINER	
KISHORE, GOLLAMUDI S	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
1615	
MAIL DATE	**DELIVERY MODE**
10/26/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/723,431	HU ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Gollamudi S. Kishore, Ph.D	1615	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 September 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-42 and 47-71* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-42 and 47-71* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

The amendment dated 9-26-07 is acknowledged.

Claims included in the prosecution are 1-42 and 47-71.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-42, 47-48, 51 and 58-71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over or WO 99/13816 by itself or in combination with EP 0 719 546.

WO 99 discloses a method of loading camptothecins using a pH gradient at a higher temperature, which is same as instant method. The lipids used include DSPC, cholesterol and phosphatidylglycerols. The buffer used is citrate buffer which is more than 5 mM. The lipid to camptothecin ratios are from 5:1 to 100:1 (abstract, pages 10-15, 18, Example 2 and claims). Although in examples, WO uses citric acid at 50 mM concentration, in view of WO's teachings that it can be higher than 5 mM, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to vary the molarity with the expectation of obtaining the best possible results. Although WO does not teach the loading of active agents other than camptothecins, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to load any agent since the principle of loading is the same. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to load any active agent since EP discussed below, which uses similar loading procedure, teaches that several active agents could be loading

using the pH gradient method. Although neither EP nor WO teach the use of sphingomyelin in the preparation of the liposomes, since it is a commonly used lipid in the liposome formations, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use this lipid with a reasonable expectation of success.

EP discloses a method of loading active agents using a pH gradient at a higher temperature. The method is applicable to several anti-cancer agents such as doxorubicin, vincristine, purine or pyrimidine compounds, antibiotics and others. The lipids used are EPC and cholesterol. Other phospholipids suggested are DSPC, DPPC, DMPC and DAPC. Although in examples, EP teaches the loading of doxorubicin at a higher pH than the interior pH of the liposomes, on col. 20, lines 44-49 it teaches that pH gradients can be established with a second external medium of relatively acidic or basic pH. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to load an active agent at an acidic medium and then relative to the liposome interior and then change the pH of the exterior to basic pH such that the active agent remains entrapped. Although EP does not disclose the use of phosphatidylglycerol in the liposomes, since it is the commonly used negatively charged lipid to provide negative charge to the liposomes, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include this phospholipid with a reasonable expectation of success. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated further to include this lipid since WO which is discussed below advocates the use of this lipid in similar active agent loading method.

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, but are not found to be persuasive. Applicant argues that WO teaches in Example 2 a 50 mM citric acid buffer and does not prepare any liposomes using an aqueous solution of at least about 60 mM of an acid. This argument is not persuasive since on page 12, line 20 through page 13 line 2, the reference teaches more than 5 mM buffers such as citric acid, ammonium citrate and ammonium sulfate and the temperature conditions. WO discusses alkyl amines and various ammonium salts in the paragraph bridging pages 14 and 15. Applicant further argues that WO does not teach or suggest that upon administration of the liposomal composition, the original gradient can be attained. This argument is not persuasive since this parameter is drawn to what happens to the composition after it is administered and applicant has not shown that the prior art composition does not behave the same way as instant composition.

3. Claims 7 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 99/13816 by itself or in combination with EP 0 719 546 as set forth above, further in view of Webb (5,814,335) of record.

The teachings of EP and WO have been discussed above. What is lacking in these references is the use of sphingomyelin as the liposome-forming lipid. The use of sphingomyelin however, would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art since Webb teaches that sphingomyelin containing liposomes are stable and have extended circulation time (abstract). Neither EP nor WO teaches the change of the pH of the external medium by using methylamine. The use of methylamine to change the pH of the external medium would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

with a reasonable expectation of success since Webb teaches the creation of pH gradient using methylamine (columns 7 and 8).

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, but are not persuasive. The examiner has already addressed applicant's arugments with regard to WO. Applicant's only argument regarding Webb is that it does not cure the deficiencies of WO since it is only cited for the use of sphingomyelin. Since no other arguments are provided, the rejection is maintained.

4. Claims 52-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 99/13816 by itself or in combination with EP 0 719 546 as set forth above, further in view of Clerc (5,939,096).

The teachings of EP and WO have been discussed above. What is lacking in these references is the teaching of dehydrating the liposomes in the presence of cryoprotectants.

Clerc while disclosing a method of drug loading by pH gradient teaches that liposomes can be dehydrated for storage in the presence of cryoprotectant sugars (col. 8, lines 9-15). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use cryoprotectants and dehydrate liposomes since they can be stored in that state as taught by Clerc.

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, but are not persuasive. The examiner has already addressed applicant's arugments with regard to WO. Applicant's only argument regarding Clerc is that it does not cure the deficiencies of WO since it is

only cited for dehydrating the liposomes in the presence of cryoprotectants. Since no other arguments are provided, the rejection is maintained.

Double Patenting

5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

6. Claims 1-42 and 47-71 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-71 of copending Application No. 10/723,610. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims in both applications are drawn to the same method of loading active agents into liposomes. In instant claims, the acid used has 'at least about 60 mM strength' whereas the acid recited in the copending

application has 'up to about 60 mM' strength. First of all the lower limit in instant claims and the upper limit in the claims of copending application overlap since 'about' provides some flexibility. Furthermore, since the active agent is loaded using a pH gradient, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to vary the amounts of the acid to obtain the best possible results. The amended claims in the copending application are drawn to anthracycline chemotherapeutic agents and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to load any compound with a reasonable expectation of success.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

This rejection is maintained since applicant has neither filed a terminal disclaimer nor provided arguments.

7. Claims 1-42 and 47-71 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 30-31 and 35-64 of U.S. Patent No. 6,740,335 by itself or in combination with EP cited above. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both patented claims and instant claims are drawn to the process of loading agents using pH gradients. Instant claims are generic with respect to the active agents loaded whereas the patented claims recite specific camptothecin compound. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to load any active agent using a pH gradient with a reasonable expectation of success. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated further to use the method to load any compound since the

reference of EP shows that any compound can be loaded using pH gradient as discussed above. Patented claims do not recite the concentration of the acid while loading the active agent and instant mM amounts therefore, are deemed to be anticipated by the claims in the patent.

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, but are not persuasive. Applicant argues that 6,740,335 is related to WO 99/13816 and therefore similar arguments are applicable. The examiner has addressed these arguments above.

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gollamudi S. Kishore, Ph.D whose telephone number is

(571) 272-0598. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 AM- 4 PM, alternate Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Woodward Michael can be reached on (571) 272-8373. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Gollamudi S Kishore, Ph.D
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1615

GSK